

SECRET

Approved For Release 2001/08/30 : CIA-RDP78-01777A000100020006-6

7461

UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT

Memorandum

TO : Director of Training

DATE: 6 December 1966

FROM : Chief, Intelligence School

SUBJECT: Comments on [REDACTED] Comments

1. The comments, observations, and suggestions that [REDACTED] has thus far submitted certainly merit consideration and discussion. I agree with you [REDACTED] that after Tom's visit to OTR is completed we should have such a discussion. I feel that at this point there is no merit in engaging Tom in a series of Socratic dialogues or in discussing among ourselves the individual aspects of his interim critiques. My own comments at this time are designed only to suggest basic points of departure that may be useful in an eventual discussion.

2. My first suggestion arises from the uncomfortable feeling that I am not quite sure of the nature and scope of Tom's mission in OTR. Originally I understood that he was here as a representative of the DDI to determine how effectively the CT program presented the "image" of the Directorate of Intelligence. It now appears that his mission is much broader than that. I certainly have no quarrel with the concept of the broader mission, but I feel that any productive discussions of Tom's comments and suggestions should be based on a clear understanding of exactly what his mission is.

3. My second suggestion is that in our eventual evaluation of Tom's recommendations we in OTR should not fall into the error of according too much honor to a prophet from another country. Tom is not only a successful and experienced officer in the area of intelligence analysis and production; he is also a highly intelligent, cultured, and perceptive person. He has had, however, very little experience in the various disciplines of training, and he has had no experience at all in the more-than-ten-year process of developing the substance of the JOT and CT programs -- a process carried out largely by experienced intelligence officers who were also professional teachers, a process that has always involved continuous evaluation in terms of Agency realities.

SECRETGROUP 1
Excluded from automatic
downgrading and
declassification

EYES ONLY

☐ UNCLASSIFIED Approved For Release 2001/08/30 : CIA-RDP78-03087A000100020006-6

EYES ONLY

☐ CONFIDENTIAL

☒ SECRET

ROUTING AND RECORD SHEET

SUBJECT: (Optional)

FROM:

Chief, Intelligence School

EXTENSION

NO.

DATE

6 December 1966

TO: (Officer designation, room number, and building)

DATE

RECEIVED

FORWARDED

OFFICER'S INITIALS

COMMENTS (Number each comment to show from whom to whom. Draw a line across column after each comment.)

 1. DDTR
819 Glebe

 9 Dec 9 *AR*

2.

 3. DTR
819 Glebe

 9 Dec *AR*

4.

Given

5.

*hold for discussion
eventual Lawler -
with *AR**

6.

7.

8.

9.

10.

11.

12.

13.

14.

15.

1 to 3: *[redacted]* feels
[redacted] charter need
clarification - this
may very well be
true - such as -
signature cannot
help but spit over
trying to be too
precise is sometimes
not really worth the
effort. Especially
when the examination
is objective & aimed
solely at trying to
improve. It will be
valuable - to focus on
the main arguments &
prepare for a day of
wrestling with them -
letting the chips fall
where they may!
AR